

APPEAL NO. 041683
FILED AUGUST 26, 2004

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 401.001 *et seq.* (1989 Act). A contested case hearing was held on June 22, 2004. The hearing officer resolved the disputed issues by determining that the appellant (claimant) did not sustain a compensable injury on _____, and did not have disability. The claimant appeals these determinations. The respondent (carrier) urges affirmance of the hearing officer's decision.

DECISION

Affirmed.

Whether the claimant sustained a compensable injury was a factual question for the hearing officer to resolve. Section 410.165(a) provides that the hearing officer, as finder of fact, is the sole judge of the relevance and materiality of the evidence as well as of the weight and credibility that is to be given to the evidence. It was for the hearing officer, as trier of fact, to resolve the inconsistencies and conflicts in the evidence. Garza v. Commercial Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, 508 S.W.2d 701, 702 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1974, no writ). This is equally true regarding medical evidence. Texas Employers Insurance Association v. Campos, 666 S.W.2d 286, 290 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1984, no writ). It was the hearing officer's prerogative to believe all, part, or none of the testimony of any witness, including that of the claimant. Aetna Insurance Company v. English, 204 S.W.2d 850 (Tex. Civ. App.-Fort Worth 1947, no writ). Nothing in our review of the record indicates that the hearing officer's compensability determination is so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong and unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986). As the existence of a compensable injury is a prerequisite to a finding of disability (Section 401.011(16)), we similarly perceive no error in the determination that the claimant did not have disability.

The claimant complains on appeal about the hearing officer's notation in the Background Information that the patrolman investigating the claimant's accident indicated that he failed to properly execute a turn. The claimant asserts that this statement resulted in a legally erroneous decision in that the hearing officer essentially found that the claimed injury could not be compensable due to fault on the part of the claimant in the accident. We disagree with the claimant's assertion. Rather, the hearing officer was noting that the patrolman's version of the accident differs from that of the claimant's and this difference impacted the claimant's credibility. We perceive no legal error in the complained-of statement.

The hearing officer's decision and order are affirmed.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **AMERICAN ZURICH INSURANCE COMPANY** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

**LEO F. MALO
12222 MERIT DRIVE, SUITE 700
DALLAS, TEXAS 75251.**

Chris Cowan
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

Robert W. Potts
Appeals Judge

Veronica L. Ruberto
Appeals Judge